

**GRADUATE COUNCIL**

**AGENDA**

**February 1, 2006**

**2:00 – 4:00 p.m**

**203 Mrak Hall**

**AGENDA ITEM**

**ATTACHMENT**

**SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

Academic Planning and Development (Baumgarth)

Administrative (Waterhouse)

Bylaws (Watkins)

Courses (Kuhl)

Educational Policy (de la Peña)

Program Review (Mechling)

Support and Welfare (Farrens)

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Announcements from the Chair (Waterhouse)

Announcements from the Dean (Gibeling)

**Graduate Student Support for 2006-2007**

**Commencement Speaker**

Announcements from the Associate Dean (Caswell-Chen)

Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (Upadhyaya)

Graduate Student Association (Karpel)

Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor (Sheets)

**Call for 2006-2007 GSADC**

5.1

Postdoctoral Scholars Association (Breslin/Cole)

**CONSENT ITEMS**

**Minutes from November 28, 2005 meeting – Draft**

5.2

**Minutes from December 15, 2005 meeting – Draft**

5.3

**DE in Native American Studies – Affiliation of Performance Studies Ph.D. Program (Waterhouse)** 5.4

**ACTION ITEMS**

**Medical Informatics – Requests to re-open admissions, change curriculum and name (de la Peña)** 5.5

**Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory Grading Option Policy – Updated (Gibeling)** 5.6

**Graduate Admission Letter of Recommendation Form – Revised proposal (Baumgarth)** 5.7

**Doctoral Qualifying Examinations – Exception for QE External Member Policy (Waterhouse)** 5.8

**Designated Emphasis Policy and Proposal Guidelines – Revised (Caswell-Chen) *To be distributed.*** 5.9 A

**Bylaws Guidelines for Designated Emphasis Program – Revised (Caswell-Chen) *To be distributed.*** 5.9 B

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**Academic Federation Response to Academic Senate Report on Shared Governance (Waterhouse)** 5.10

**Distinguished Graduate Mentoring Award – Introduction to topic of changes made to award  
by Senate Committees (Waterhouse)**

**INFORMATIONAL ITEM**

**Graduate Council and Subcommittee Membership Lists. *To be distributed at the meeting.*** 5.11

Andrew Waterhouse, Chair

**MINUTES**  
**GRADUATE COUNCIL**  
**Wednesday, February 1, 2006**

**PRESENT:** *Members:* N. Baumgarth, C. de la Peña, M. Farrens, J. Gibeling, T. Kuhl, W. Leal, J. Mechling, H. Mueller, S. Upadhyaya, A. Waterhouse, E. Watkins  
*Representatives:* J. Breslin, C. Hom, J. Karpel, A. Kelleher, S. O'Neill, A. Sheets  
*Graduate Studies attendees:* S. Albrecht, H. Cuevas, K. Garcia, Y. Shi, L. Wilce

**ABSENT:** *Members:* A. Britt, J. Cadden, R. Wu  
*Representatives:* C. Bates, E. Caswell-Chen

**SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

The subcommittee chairs reported on their current and future activities.

**Academic Planning and Development**

APD Chair Professor Nicole Baumgarth reported that APD will assess the current graduate programs by examining the last summary statements from each of the available program reviews. APD wants to develop a rating structure based on key program weaknesses and determine if there are any patterns. The second set of information that APD is examining are the lists and numbers of Senate and Federation faculty on campus, to determine how many and which faculty members are associated with each graduate program. The ultimate goal is to find some sort of connectivity among graduate programs and because faculty members are often associated with more than one graduate program, their membership is a way to do this. If APD is able to come up with some sort of connectivity, then they may really be able to identify large broad areas of graduate education on this campus. Professor Baumgarth reported that the APD members attending the meetings are very committed to this project.

One Council member asked whether APD would also be examining graduate student support and other aspects of the whole program or just the faculty component. Professor Baumgarth responded that APD has information on the number of students in the programs and is examining the sources of their funding. The committee hopes to identify key funding, as well as academic and infrastructure, issues from the program review reports.

**Administrative**

Chair Andrew Waterhouse reported that the committee has met several times, primarily regarding student appeals. Two other items are on today's agenda.

**Bylaws**

Bylaws Chair Evan Watkins reported that two items are on today's agenda. He expected to have four to five sets of revised bylaws to present at the next Council meeting if the programs submit their final revisions.

**Courses**

Courses Chair Tonya Kuhl reported that her committee completed the review of all the course requests last quarter. Currently, there are 30-40 new requests awaiting her committee whose goal is not to have a backlog at the end of academic year.

**Program Review**

PRC Chair Jay Mechling reported that PRC's current cycle of reviews is starting this week, that he and Analyst Kathy Garcia have been meeting with the program chairs for next year's reviews, and that everything is on track due to Ms. Garcia's hard work.

Professor Mechling presented two situations regarding current reviews that need to be resolved. The School of Education still wishes to postpone the review of the stand-alone master's program and the combined master's/credential program. The PRC has already postponed the reviews of three other Education programs: the Ph.D. graduate group, the JDPEL Ed.D., and the credential program. The credential program was postponed because the State accreditation review is expected in the next two years. However, PRC was planning to proceed with the master's program review and notified Education. There is still resistance to proceeding with the review from the School of Education. The second situation has to do with the Human Development review, which has been delayed but is getting underway now.

Professor Mechling thought the Education M.A. review was the more pressing situation at this point because the Education master's program has not been reviewed for quite awhile. Chair Waterhouse distributed a letter from Associate Dean Sharon Dugdale in order to give her request a hearing by Council so that the decision regarding the timing of this review could be concluded. Associate Dean Dugdale has spoken with him several times. Chair Waterhouse summarized the primary reasons that she has presented for delaying the review for one year. These included a concern of how one element (the MA) could be reviewed in the absence of reviewing the other (the Credential), as well as the possibility that the same pool of students would be asked to complete two sets of confidential questionnaires and might perceive this as inefficient.

Professor Mechling presented PRC's response to the request to delay the master's program review. The last review of the stand-alone M.A. program, which currently is a small program with nine students, was closed in 1995 at the end of four years; the review began in 1991. The combined M.A./Credential program was approved in 2001-2002 as a track of the existing Education M.A. program and is now five years into its life and has not yet been reviewed. Professor Mechling explained how PRC reviews professional programs that also receive accreditation reviews. If the accreditation review is as rigorous as PRC's review, it may be substituted for the program's self-review and possibly the PRC report. Because the state suspended its reviews for several years, the credential's accreditation review has been postponed and now is expected to probably take place in 2007-2008. However, the M.A. program has not been reviewed in 15 years and when the state reviews the credential program, it is not going to review the master's component. In addition, Professor Mechling thought that there were benefits to reviewing the master's program before the credential and Ph.D. programs. The M.A. review is overdue and he recommended proceeding with it now.

Dean Gibeling reported that the master's/credential was proposed as a track in the master's program and the students were supposed to obtain a master's and a credential. However, the credential aspect appears to be driving the program. The students obtain the credential first and then if they are doing well enough, they continue and obtain the master's.

Council members raised several questions to clarify the timing of the reviews, the benefits of conducting the master's review prior to the credential and Ph.D. reviews, and the issue of whether the same students in fact would be required to complete two sets of review questionnaires. The Education M.A. review would be of the stand-alone master's program and the master's component of the combined master's/credential program. Professor Mechling reported that when one looks at the Web site, these two master's programs appear to have little overlap. He added that the

graduate program review process is not intended to be adversarial and that most graduate programs report that the review is a rare opportunity for faculty to get together to examine their program, what they are delivering and the direction they wish to take in the future. Education may wish to examine the role of the master's degree in education, especially because they are also talking about another track. There would be no external reviewer for the master's degree program; the reviewers would be just an *ad hoc* committee from Davis. Dean Gibeling noted that if the School of Education truly wants to propose the M.Ed., it is unlikely that Council would approve that without having previously reviewed the M.A.

Based on the sense of the Council, Chair Waterhouse will write Associate Dean Dugdale that Council has decided to proceed with the Education M.A. program review. Professor Mechling stated that PRC would adjust the review deadlines as needed. He added that PRC would need to examine the state's new review process for credential programs to ensure that it is as rigorous as expected and can be accepted in lieu of the PRC review in the future.

### **Educational Policy**

EPC Chair Carolyn de la Peña reported that her committee has an item on today's agenda. EPC has six outstanding responses from programs regarding their degree requirement changes. Some of the items expected to come forward include the proposal for the Designated Emphasis in Studies in Performance and Practice, requests for five concurrent master's/MBA programs, and more requests for degree requirement changes. Also, another proposal for a new DE is coming forward. Professor de la Peña plans to distribute the work among the EPC members.

### **Support and Welfare**

Support and Welfare Chair Matthew Farrens reported that his committee and the faculty volunteers are about to enter the busy fellowship season. Director Steven Albrecht reported that 60 faculty reviewers have been recruited, the graduate programs' deadline to submit student fellowship applications to the Office of Graduate Studies is February 9, and the faculty will start reviewing the applications on February 14, 2006.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **Announcements from the Chair**

Chair Andrew Waterhouse introduced two items for future Council discussion. He reported that there are a number of people on campus who have **Adjunct faculty** appointments and are members of graduate groups. An example is USDA faculty with the Human Nutrition Research Center who are in the Nutritional Biology Graduate Group. The chair's term had expired and the graduate group recommended two faculty members, one of whom was a USDA member who had all the qualifications, worked in academia, and was very familiar with graduate education. However, the USDA has rules that prohibit their employees from making financial decisions in other organizations. Because graduate group chairs have that responsibility in the context of allocating block grant funds, the USDA person was unable to serve as chair. By being unable to serve as chair, USDA members essentially are placed in a separate category. In the past, Council has been very clear that it does not want any distinction between members of a graduate group. Chair Waterhouse's concern is that this USDA rule creates a separate category of graduate group members. This issue will be a topic for discussion at future meetings.

Chair Waterhouse presented another discussion topic. He has received requests from several people from overseas who are interested in how UC Davis manages graduate programs and how program reviews are conducted. In Europe there is a push to unify graduate curricula. Some universities are undertaking some sort of review process for the first time and they are very

interested in how we conduct reviews here. One person has asked if she could come to UCD on some sort of short sabbatical and study how we administer graduate programs. This request suggests that some people feel that the way we run our business is very effective. Normally, there are faculty exchange visits where the faculty learn about research in another university by working with another faculty member. This would be an **administrative sabbatical**. Dean Gibeling reiterated one aspect of what Chair Waterhouse reported. He has read a Council of Graduate Schools publication on graduate program review and found that there was remarkably little new information in it for UCD. Graduate Council's Program Review Committee knows how to conduct program reviews very well; the publication was a testimony to Council's efforts.

### **Announcements from the Dean**

**Graduate Student Support for 2006-2007.** Dean Gibeling reported that the block grant letters have been distributed to the graduate programs. The block grants are not changed very much from last year but the Provost has committed to the investment that she discussed with the Council in buying down fees and NRT by 25% for students who are supported as GSRs on extramural funds for this year.

The governor's budget contains all the expected items, namely that NRT would drop from 25% to 0% of NRT for doctoral students who are advanced to candidacy, for a period of three years. In addition, the NRT is not expected to increase next year. The governor's budget is going through the legislature and should be finalized in July. If the buy-down program is added to the NRT reduction down to zero, for a faculty member supporting a Ph.D. student who has advanced to candidacy on a research grant, the comparison with the current academic year would show about a 46% reduction in the cost to the grant, which is significant. Faculty should appreciate that there are some real and significant cost reductions or cost savings.

A Council member asked how widely publicized was the 25% buy-down of fees and NRT for GSRs. She reported that she publicized it to her graduate group, whose faculty members were unaware of the change and were happy to hear the news. Dean Gibeling responded that the information was in the block grant letters, Chair Waterhouse would present it orally to the Representative Assembly on Friday, it will be in a *Dateline* article next week Friday, the Provost will present it in her update, and that he will present it at his graduate program chairs meetings. The Council member recommended sending the information directly to the faculty. She added that talk of getting rid of all the NRT would disappear if there were 50% buy-down. The Dean responded that that was the Provost's goal but it is not clear how long it will take.

The Dean reported that the Graduate Deans systemwide and others are also discussing other schemes. The one that is most likely to garner support is that international students would pay NRT for one year just like domestic students from out of state and then there would be no NRT after that. However, the UCOP, the legislature, the governor, and whoever is paying for this reduction is not going to want to have an open-ended approach to 0% NRT. There will need to be a mechanism to maintain the time to degree pressure after advancement to candidacy. A Council member pointed out that the common model at other universities ties NRT fellowships or waivers to student employment. Dean Gibeling thought that to completely erase NRT is too expensive at this point, that we just have to keep chipping away at it.

**Commencement Speaker.** Dean Gibeling reported that a couple of years ago Council agreed that the commencement speaker(s) should be graduate students(s). He asked whether Council had any different thoughts about who the speaker should be this year. The Office of Graduate Studies is

preparing to send out the announcement seeking speaker nominations. He welcomed comments or nominations of graduate students who are graduating this June.

**Admissions.** Dean Gibeling reported that as of Monday, the Office of Graduate Studies had almost 7,000 applications, which puts the number very close to the total in 2004 and that is substantially above last year. We were at a total of 6,893 where last year we were at 6,453. Most of those are from domestic applicants, with significant increases in the usual categories that fall into under-represented minorities: African American, Hispanic, and Native American. In the end, it depends on how many applicants are admitted and how many of those actually choose to come here. With some of these changes in graduate student support, we will be in a better financial position to admit and enroll students and be able to offer them significant financial support packages.

**Chancellor's Fall Conference.** Dean Gibeling announced that the topic of the 2006 Chancellor's Fall Conference will be graduate education. The last time that graduate education was the topic was in 1998. He reported that we have not organized the planning committee yet so the topic has not yet been decided upon, but his goal is to stay away from talking about more money and to focus on the kinds of topics for which the Academic Planning and Development Committee is laying the ground work, for example, academic planning, thinking about where the campus is going, how to put programs together, and what graduate students need.

**National Initiatives.** Dean Gibeling reported that there are various national initiatives that are being reported in the press and even by President Bush. These initiatives are coming from a perspective of American competitiveness, getting at the idea of better funding for science and math education and research. There are many different activities, all coming out of Washington D.C. There are many references to an upcoming publication from the National Academies called *Rising Above the Gathering Storm*. Dean Gibeling showed Council a copy of the cover page of the report and will send Council the link to this document.

The Association of American Universities (UCD is one of the 62 AAU institutions) has something they call The National Defense Education and Innovation Initiative that attempts to lay out a framework for advancing the United States in science and technology. The Council of Graduate Schools (CGS) has something they are calling the National Defense Education Act 21; it is a revisit of the 1958 NDEA that followed from the Sputnik era and is based on the premise that the U.S. is under a similar threat today. The good part of 1958 NDEA was that it did not focus just on science and engineering, but also on languages, culture and social sciences. It included the whole range of disciplines; our country had to be broadly prepared to be part of the world of the future. The idea of American competitiveness has broad attention from the White House as evidenced in the proposed American Competitiveness Initiative. U.S. Senators Mikulski, Alexander, Bingaman and Domenici have proposed the Protecting America's Competitive Edge Act, called the PACE Act. The senators are from the two parties so there is bipartisan support. Dean Gibeling expressed his hope that these reports and activities will all come together to provide support for graduate education. All of these contain a graduate student support component, whether it is in the research money, new kinds of fellowships, or in other ways.

### **Announcements from the Associate Dean**

Associate Dean Edward Caswell-Chen was out of town.

### **Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs**

Professor Shrinivasa Upadhyaya reported that CCGA did not meet in December. At the January 10, 2006 meeting, there were three graduate program proposals from the UC Davis campus. The proposal for the M.A.S. in Clinical Research, which was held up for a long time, was approved. CCGA was waiting for a revision to the proposal for the joint Ph.D. program in Criminal Justice Sciences with UC Davis and CSU Fresno. Dean Gibeling reported that the two campuses are working on the revisions requested by CCGA. Professor Upadhyaya reported that the proposal for the Horticulture and Agronomy Ph.D. had just arrived. Another item that CCGA discussed was the graduate mentoring award. Professor Upadhyaya was glad to see this item on today's agenda because the various campuses are all looking at this issue right now.

### **Graduate Student Association**

GSA Vice Chair Ann Kelleher had an announcement. She reported that March 1, 2006 will be the deadline for nominations for the GSA Award for Excellence in Service to Graduate Students. Nominators must be graduate students and the award is for staff, faculty or administrators. Last year, two awardees were members of Graduate Council. This award is to recognize faculty, administrators, and staff who go above and beyond to help graduate students both in terms of their personal lives and their academic careers as students. It ties a little bit into mentoring, especially for faculty who are perceived as mentors but also people who work for Dean Gibeling. Dr. Teresa Dillinger is a past recipient. This is GSA's fourth year of offering the award. It will be advertised in places like Grad Link. Ms. Kelleher asked Council faculty to mention it to their students. Graduate students can nominate anyone they want, as long as they are a faculty member, staff member or administrator.

### **Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor**

Ms. Alison Sheets presented the **Call for the 2006-2007 GSADC**. She asked Council to inform students interested in learning more about administration about this call. There will be an information session on February 22, 2006 from noon to 1 p.m. The only requirement for this position is that the graduate student has advanced to candidacy by July 1, 2006. The GSADC serves on committees such as Graduate Council and conducts projects of one's own design that will be beneficial to other graduate students. For instance one of her projects is developing a survey of graduate students' awareness of, and their need for, mental and physical health services on campus, and then preparing a report on her findings. The other responsibility of the position is to plan the Week of Welcome (WOW) in the fall for new incoming graduate students. Ms. Sheets asked Council to please pass this message to their students.

### **Postdoctoral Scholars Association**

Dr. Jerry Breslin reported that he attended the systemwide postdoctoral scholars meeting over the weekend, and learned that there has been this unionization of postdoctoral scholars movement going on at UCSF and which is now spreading down to UCLA. He quickly put together a letter for Council to explain what is happening, to try to help the faculty to be prepared, to not be caught off guard in the event that the union comes to Davis soon. Basically, the PSA's stance is neutral. As a campus advisory group, the PSA legally cannot tell postdocs whether or not to join the union but it can provide information. According to law, if the union gathers signatures from 50% +1 of the postdoc population, all postdocs will be represented by the union. The union tends to target international postdocs, who may not really understand labor practices in the U.S. Union representatives have been approaching people in their laboratories. He has heard stories of some postdocs signing the card just to get the people to leave. He thought many postdocs do not really understand that they are going to have to pay dues, that they are going to lose their rights as individuals to negotiate for salary and benefits. Negotiations would have to be done by the union. There are two informational Web sites listed at the end of the letter.

Dr. Breslin expressed his hope that faculty mentors will be able to discuss this issue with their postdocs so the postdocs can be informed. He thought that legally faculty cannot tell their postdocs they must or cannot sign the card. Again as PSA and UCPS chair, he cannot say that he favors one way or the other. This PRO/UAW union has not given a reason why they are trying to unionize the postdocs. They just suddenly appeared one day. The postdoctoral scholars do not know what this is all about. A Council member asked whether the union has approached the PSA to talk about unionization or is just approaching individuals. Dr. Breslin reported the union is just approaching individuals. The chair of the PSA at UCSF did contact and talk with someone from the union but reported it was not productive. In response to another question, Dr. Breslin thought that just postdoctoral scholars were being targeted. Dean Gibeling asked whether there were any particular issues of concern. Dr. Breslin responded that the PSAs do not know what the issues are. [An electronic copy of the PSA letter was distributed to Council on February 9, 2006.]

### **CONSENT ITEMS**

Because no one requested to move any of the items off the consent list, they were approved as presented. The minutes will be posted on the Web and Chair Waterhouse will notify the DE Chair that the requested affiliation was approved.

**Minutes from November 28, 2005 meeting – Draft**

**Minutes from December 15, 2005 meeting – Draft**

**DE in Native American Studies – Affiliation of Performance Studies Ph.D. Program**

### **ACTION ITEMS**

**Medical Informatics – Requests to re-open admissions, change curriculum and name**

EPC Chair de la Peña walked Council through the most important items in the packet. Admissions to Medical Informatics were suspended in 2004. Professor de la Peña pointed out former Graduate Council Chair Trish Berger's letter explaining Council's decision to deny the program's request to reopen admissions last year and the most important paragraph, which explains the primary concern, which came out of APD: Medical Informatics lacked a critical mass of faculty with established research programs and publications in peer reviewed journals. Last year's proposal to reopen admissions included a program with three separate tracks, each of which had a great number of courses. The concern was both that there were too many tracks and that it was not clear who was in charge of mentoring research. It was not clear what the research component of Medical Informatics was, whether it was a technical program or a research oriented graduate group.

Some weeks ago the EPC reviewed Professor Yellowlees' response to last year's denial to reopen admissions. The committee considered whether the conditions that were established last year in the APD review and the ultimate Graduate Council decision had been met by the graduate group and whether EPC could recommend reopening admissions. Professor de la Peña pointed out what Professor Yellowlees did, which was to create a single track instead of three separate track program, to remove members of the graduate group who were not actively involved in research related to the program, and to include co-instructors (junior faculty to be mentored by more senior faculty and more senior researchers) for some of the courses.

Professor de la Peña pointed out her memo to Chair Waterhouse regarding EPC's review. Two responses came out of EPC to this new proposal: (1) a general housekeeping category, including problems with clarity and ensuring that information matched up with Council's Degree Requirements Policy. Those issues remain but they can be accomplished and EPC has already

made recommendations for revisions to the graduate group. (2) The other concern was to determine whether Medical Informatics is indeed a research program. Two people on EPC, with very different backgrounds, reviewed this aspect but still had questions after examining the documentation provided. It was difficult to understand the track, how each of the courses was connected to a viable area of research, and how the instructors represented faculty with specific research agenda. Again, the ultimate test was: is this program research oriented or is it primarily technical, which was a larger debate at Graduate Council last year. Council thought the focus of graduate programs here at UCD should be research. Professor de la Peña contacted Professor Yellowlees with three concerns regarding the larger question of research. EPC wanted to see that the program had a clear research component including descriptions of how individual courses contribute to research, clarification of the qualifications of the faculty, and additional information about the process by which prospective students can find out about the graduate group, especially the M.S. degree requirements. EPC thought that the documentation was confusing for this program; the degree requirements were not clear.

Professor Yellowlees' response to EPC includes a Web site where prospective students go to look for information on the program. The Web site is very efficient, the information is streamlined, and EPC determined that it is acceptable. Again, the material on the Web site is in a preliminary state because there are no students. Professor de la Peña explained that the information about the program is available on paper and her concern was just how easily it could be accessed by prospective students. That concern has been resolved.

EPC also received an updated list of faculty members in the graduate group. Hard copies of the CVs are in the binder, which was brought to today's meeting; they are also on the Graduate Council page of the MySenate Web site. Professor Yellowlees also provided an updated list of the graduate group's faculty members and their home departments and a table of information for each of the M.S. program's core courses. The faculty list shows they are from a range of departments, schools and colleges. The table for the program's one track includes the following information for each course: the name(s) of the faculty who will teach it, how faculty are being paired, areas of research that each course engages (so that we can understand that these are not just course titles, they are in fact preparing students to take on particular kinds of research projects with expertise), the instructors' relevant areas of expertise, and additional faculty who also have corresponding research interests. Professor de la Peña reported that Associate Dean Caswell-Chen gave EPC an excellent summary of the research area that is medical informatics. His description very much clarified for EPC how it is that dealing with information within the field of medicine is a technical skill but is certainly facilitating research projects dealing with vast amounts of data and taking on particular questions.

Professor de la Peña's request to Professor Yellowlees and his response to her took place after EPC's last meeting, where EPC's primary reviewers of Medical Informatics expressed their concerns. Since then, she has been in e-mail contact with the reviewers. She reported that she is comfortable recommending re-opening admissions to Medical Informatics, given that the primary concern was that this program prove that it is based in research, preparing students to do research, and that the faculty who are affiliated have very clear research track records in those areas. She thought that the faculty CVs show a combination of peer reviewed publications and grants, significant grants that have produced things that are used, not necessarily falling under the peer reviewed article, but that the combination of these is of sufficient strength to reopen the program as a one track program that is interested in expanding. Additional tracks, certificates and the Ph.D. program will be proposed and added over time.

Professor de la Peña expressed interest in Council's comments, particularly from people with experience in areas related to Medical Informatics. Council's discussion included clarifying that Medical Informatics is a Plan I (Thesis) program and the following topics: whether medical informatics is a new or old field, what constitutes medical informatics, whether it is a research or service area, a comparison with bioinformatics, and the School of Medicine's support for this program. Professor de la Peña reminded Council that the graduate group has responded satisfactorily to the concerns regarding reopening admissions that Graduate Council raised last year: the proposed three tracks, the research specialization, and the core faculty. Council discussed when the program might be reviewed again. New master's programs are typically reviewed for the first time three years after the admissions of students, then on the regular seven year cycle.

Professor de la Peña made the motion to re-open admissions to the program that has been called Medical Informatics, to approve a simple name change from Medical Informatics to Health Informatics because there are no other ramifications, and to treat this program as though it were a new program with regard to its review, scheduling its next review on an initial three-year date from the admission date of its first full cohort of students. It is expected that the program will submit its revised degree requirements to EPC for review and approval before the end of the year. The motion was seconded and the vote in favor was unanimous. Professor Watkins pointed out that the graduate group also needs to submit its bylaws for review and approval. Chair Waterhouse will notify Dean Gibeling of Council's recommendations.

#### **Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory Grading Option Policy – Updated**

Dean Gibeling reported that this year as questions come up in the Office of Graduate Studies, we try to formulate them into a policy, a policy revision or appropriate procedures so we have a firm basis on which to base our decisions when students make requests. One of these is the proposed updated policy on the S/U grading option. He distributed a handout of the 1988 policy that laid out an S/U grading option policy. The new policy is an amalgamation of the 1988 version and some other versions. This updated policy has been reviewed by the Administrative Committee, which suggested changes that were incorporated. Dean Gibeling thought that this policy is in line with Council's discussion last year: namely that students can take one graded course per quarter on an S/U basis as long as they are exploring outside their major discipline unless they are advanced to candidacy for the Ph.D., in which case, they can take an unlimited number of courses on an S/U basis. Another limitation is that the policy precludes students from taking courses that are prerequisites or taken to make up deficiencies in their background, for example, if they changed fields from their undergraduate study to their graduate program. Therefore, the policy applies to undergraduate courses as well as graduate courses.

Chair Waterhouse pointed out that this change is the one thing that is new this year; the previous policy did not specify how to handle these prerequisites and deficiencies. There are many students who take these courses S/U right now. It seemed inappropriate because generally if students are making up deficiencies, the courses were required for their admission in the first place. Generally, the courses would be in the very discipline in which they are studying. Presumably if they had taken those courses as undergraduates, they would not have been allowed to take them pass/not pass because the courses would have been in part of their major. Because there are so many requests for S/Us for these courses, Dean Gibeling and he felt that the policy needed to be clarified.

Dean Gibeling pointed out that the policy allows programs to request specific exceptions. The Office of Graduate Studies has a list of specific exceptions that have accumulated over the years. However, the original requests for exception are all no longer on file. We do not know what justifications for the exceptions have been used in the past. The new policy would be a way of

starting over again. Programs with exceptions would have to make their requests again and provide justification that the Administrative Committee would review and accept or not. Council discussed the policy, keeping the overarching philosophy that the S/U option would be for exploratory courses, and that the policy refers to letter graded courses that can be taken with the S/U option. Professor Walter Leal made the motion to approve the policy. The motion was seconded and the vote in favor was unanimous.

### **Graduate Admission Letter of Recommendation Form – Revised proposal**

Professor Baumgarth presented a revised proposal based on Council' debate and discussion of the form at its last meeting, when Dean Gibeling heard Council's points of view. She reminded Council that this was a review of the admissions letter of recommendation form. The APD examined the current letter form and those of 10-15 other institutions and made a number of recommendations. Her revised proposal suggests two votes on whether to:

- (1) Retain this rating system box or not? (Almost every other university includes one.)
- (2) If the rating box is retained, then what is the pool of people to use as the comparison group?

After Council's discussion, Professor Hans Mueller made the motion to retain the rating system box. The motion was seconded. There were seven votes in favor and one opposed. There were no abstentions. The motion was carried. Chair Waterhouse will transmit Council's recommendations to Dean Gibeling.

Professor Baumgarth described the second issue regarding the comparison population pool. She explained that a faculty member's point of view depended on one's discipline and whether they were most familiar with graduate or undergraduate students. Council discussed the three options. Dean Gibeling reminded Council that there would be three letters of recommendation for each applicant, possibly comparing the applicant to different pools. Professors Mechling and Mueller made the motion to approve Option 1: "How does this applicant compare to other students that have gone on to graduate school?" The motion was seconded. A Council member raised the concern of the ratings being used internally in ranking fellowship applications but this is not a new concern. The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

### **Doctoral Qualifying Examinations – Exception for QE External Member Policy**

Chair Waterhouse Council presented a new policy regarding how the Administrative Committee would review program requests for an exception to the requirement to have an external member on the student's Qualifying Examination Committee. He reported that Council has received several requests for exception, primarily for two reasons: (1) The program has a large number of faculty members from outside it and everyone interested in the discipline was already in the group. Therefore, there was no need to go outside the very broad campus based group. (2) The only "outside" people were those who did not want to be in group. The Administrative committee considered these issues and thought that it made sense that if the group was very large and drew its membership from a very large number of units, this exception would make sense. The committee drafted this policy. The request would come to the Administrative Committee, which would review and vote on it, using this policy to make its decision to approve or deny the request. Chair Waterhouse reported that Council has received four or five requests so far. Of those, the committee would approve two or three requests and would definitely not approve two requests, based on this policy. A Council member thought that the policy needed to say something about "large versus small" programs. An outside member might be beneficial for a small program. Council agreed to insert the word "large" but not to specify numbers in the policy. Another Council member asked if it would be difficult to check whether there is an "outside" member on

each QE. Dean Gibeling reported that the faculty member's departmental affiliation is recorded on the form and that the program's Graduate Adviser should check for an outside member.

Professor Leal made the motion to approve the policy with the amendment to insert "large". The motion was seconded and the vote was unanimous. Dean Gibeling and Chair Waterhouse discussed whether this policy should be a stand-alone policy or part of the existing Doctoral Qualifying Examinations Policy. [It was added at the end of the previously approved policy as a revision.]

**Designated Emphasis Policy and Proposal Guidelines – Revised  
Bylaws Guidelines for Designated Emphasis Program – Revised**

Professor Watkins reported that these two documents were revised in response to questions raised at Council's last meeting regarding faculty membership in DEs. Because the new *Bylaws Guidelines for Designated Emphasis Programs* (DE Bylaws Guidelines) refer to the *Designated Emphasis Policy and Proposal Guidelines* (DE Policy), it was necessary to re-examine both documents. Associate Dean Caswell-Chen and Analysts Garcia and Lee Wilce suggested revisions to the DE policy. Professor Watkins pointed out the revisions, which were mostly wording changes. The two substantive changes included inserting a section on Faculty in the DE Policy and changing the DE faculty membership term from two to three years in the DE Bylaws Guidelines. Professor Watkins made the motion to approve both revised documents. The motion was seconded and the vote in favor was unanimous. The documents will be posted on the Web.

The rest of the agenda items below were carried over due to lack of time.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**Academic Federation Response to Academic Senate Report on Shared Governance**

**Distinguished Graduate Mentoring Award – Introduction to topic of changes made to award by Senate Committees**

**INFORMATIONAL ITEM**

**Graduate Council and Subcommittee Membership Lists**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:57 P.m.

OGS – lsw